arXiv:1409.2751v2 [math.DS] 10 Sep 2014

ON THE MINIMUM EXIT RATE FOR A DIFFUSION PROCESS PERTAINING TO A CHAIN OF DISTRIBUTED CONTROL SYSTEMS WITH RANDOM PERTURBATIONS *

GETACHEW K. BEFEKADU† AND PANOS J. ANTSAKLIS†

Abstract. In this paper, we consider the problem of minimizing the exit rate with which a diffusion process pertaining to a chain of distributed control systems, with random perturbations, exits from a given bounded open domain. In particular, we consider a chain of distributed control systems that are formed by n subsystems (with $n \geq 2$), where the random perturbation enters only in the first subsystem and is then subsequently transmitted to the other subsystems. Furthermore, we assume that, for any $\ell \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$, the distributed control systems, which is formed by the first ℓ subsystems, satisfies an appropriate Hörmander condition. As a result of this, the diffusion process is degenerate, in the sense that the infinitesimal generator associated with it is a degenerate parabolic equation. Our interest is to establish a connection between the minimum exit rate with which the diffusion process exits from the given domain and the principal eigenvalue for the infinitesimal generator with zero boundary conditions. Such a connection allows us to derive a family of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations for which we provide a verification theorem that shows the validity of the corresponding optimal control problems. Finally, we provide an estimate on the attainable exit probability of the diffusion process with respect to a set of admissible (optimal) Markov controls for the optimal control problems.

Key words. Diffusion processes, distributed control systems, exit probabilities, HJB equations, Markov controls, minimum exit rates, principal eigenvalues

AMS subject classifications. 34D20, 37H10, 37J25, 49K15, 49L20, 49L25

1. Introduction. In this paper, we consider the problem of minimizing the exit rate with which the diffusion process $x^i(t)$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, exits from a given bounded open domain pertaining to the following distributed control systems with random perturbations (see Fig. 1.1)[1]

$$\left.\begin{aligned} dx^1(t) &= m_1\big(x^1(t), u_1(t)\big)dt + \sigma\big(x^1(t)\big)dW(t) \\ dx^2(t) &= m_2\big(x^1(t), x^2(t), u_2(t)\big)dt \\ &\vdots \\ dx^i(t) &= m_i\big(x^1(t), x^2(t), \ldots, x^i(t), u_i(t)\big)dt \\ &\vdots \\ dx^n(t) &= m_n\big(x^1(t), x^2(t), \ldots, x^n(t), u_n(t)\big)dt \\ x^1(0) &= x_0^1,\ x^2(0) = x_0^2,\ \ldots,\ x^n(0) = x_0^n,\ t \geq 0 \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{1.1}$$

where

- $x^i(\cdot)$ is an $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued diffusion process that corresponds to the ith-subsystem (with $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and $n \geq 2$),
- the functions $m_i \colon \mathbb{R}^{i \times d} \times \mathcal{U}_i \to \mathbb{R}^d$ are uniformly Lipschitz, with bounded first derivatives,

*Received by the editors September 08, 2014. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. CNS-1035655. The first author acknowledges support from the Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Notre Dame.

†Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA (gbefekadu1@nd.edu, antsaklis.1@nd.edu).

[1]This work is, in some sense, a continuation of our previous paper [1].

- $\sigma\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times m}$ is Lipschitz with the least eigenvalue of $\sigma(\cdot)\,\sigma^T(\cdot)$ uniformly bounded away from zero, i.e.,

$$\sigma(x)\,\sigma^T(x) \geq \lambda I_{d\times d}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

for some $\lambda > 0$,

- $W(\cdot)$ (with $W(0) = 0$) is a d-dimensional standard Wiener process,

- $u_i(\cdot)$ is a $\mathcal{U}_i$-valued measurable control process to the ith-subsystem (i.e., an admissible control from the measurable set $\mathcal{U}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{r_i}$) such that for all $t > s$, $W(t) - W(s)$ is independent of $u_i(\nu)$ for $\nu \leq s$ (nonanticipativity condition) and

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t_1} |u_i(t)|^2 dt < \infty, \quad \forall t_1 \geq 0,$$

for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.



where

$$\begin{gathered} S_1:\ dx^1(t) = m_1\big(x^1(t), u_1(t)\big)dt + \sigma\big(x^1(t)\big)dW(t), \\ S_i:\ dx^i(t) = m_i\big(x^1(t), x^2(t), \ldots, x^i(t), u_i(t)\big)dt,\ i = 2, 3, \ldots n, \\ u_j = \kappa_j(x^j),\ j = 1, 2, \ldots n. \end{gathered}$$

Fig. 1.1: A chain of distributed control systems with random perturbations

In what follows, we consider a particular class of admissible controls $u_i(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_i$, for $i = 1, 2 \ldots, n$, of the form $\kappa_i(x^i(t))$, $t \geq 0$, with a measurable map κ_i from $\mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathcal{U}_i$ and, thus, such a measurable map κ_i is called a stationary Markov control.

REMARK 1. *Note that the function m_i, with an admissible control $\kappa_i(x^i)$, depends only on x^1, x^2, …, x^i. For any $\ell \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$, we assume that the distributed control systems, which is formed by the first ℓ subsystems, satisfies an appropriate Hörmander condition (e.g., see [2]). Furthermore, the random perturbation has to pass through the second subsystem, the third subsystem, and so on to the ith-subsystem. Hence, such a chain of distributed control systems is described by an $n \times d$ dimensional diffusion process, which is degenerate in the sense that the infinitesimal generator associated with it is a degenerate parabolic equation (see also Remark 3).*

Let $D_i \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, be bounded open domains with smooth boundaries (i.e., ∂D_i is a manifold of class C^2). Moreover, let Ω_ℓ be the open sets that are given by

$$\Omega_\ell = D_1 \times D_2 \times \cdots \times D_\ell, \quad \ell = 2, 3, \ldots, n.$$

Suppose that the distributed control systems in Equation (1.1) are composed with a set of admissible Markov controls κ_i, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Further, let $\tau^\ell = \tau^\ell(x^1, \ldots, x^\ell)$, for

$\ell \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$, be the first exit-time for the diffusion process $x^\ell(t)$ (which corresponds to the ℓth-subsystem) from the given domain D_ℓ, i.e.,

$$\tau^\ell = \inf\Big\{ t > 0 \,\big|\, x^\ell(t) \in \partial D_\ell \Big\}, \tag{1.2}$$

which also depends on the behavior of the solutions to the following (deterministic) distributed control systems

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} d\xi^1(t) = \hat{m}_1\big(\xi^1(t)\big)dt \\ d\xi^j(t) = \hat{m}_j\big(\xi^1(t), \xi^2(t), \ldots, \xi^j(t)\big)dt,\ t \geq 0,\ j = 2, \ldots, \ell \end{array}\right\}, \tag{1.3}$$

where

$$\hat{m}_i\big(\xi^1(t), \ldots, \xi^i(t)\big) \triangleq m_i\big(\xi^1(t), \ldots, \xi^i(t), \kappa_i(\xi^i(t))\big),\ i = 1, 2, \ldots, \ell.$$

REMARK 2. *In this paper, we assume that the origin is a (unique) globally asymptotically stable equilibrium point for the above (deterministic) distributed control systems.*

Notice that the infinitesimal generator for the diffusion processes $\big(x^1(t), x^2(t), \ldots, x^\ell(t)\big)$ (when $u_i(t) = \kappa_i(x^i(t))$, $\forall t \geq 0$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, \ell$) is given by

$$\mathcal{L}^\ell_\kappa(\cdot)\big(x^1, \ldots, x^\ell\big) = \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{\ell} \big\langle \bigtriangledown(\cdot), \hat{m}_i\big(x^1, \ldots, x^i\big)\big\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{tr}\Big\{\sigma(x^1)\sigma^T(x^1)\,\bigtriangledown^2(\cdot)\Big\} \tag{1.4}$$

with $a(x^1) = \sigma(x^1)\,\sigma^T(x^1)$ and

$$\hat{m}_i\big(x^1(t), \ldots, x^i(t)\big) = m_i\big(x^1(t), \ldots, x^i(t), \kappa_i(x^i(t))\big),\ i = 1, 2, \ldots, \ell.$$

In this paper, we assume that the following statements hold for the chain of distributed control systems in Equation (1.1).

Assumption 1.

(a) The infinitesimal generator in Equation (1.4) *is hypoelliptic in $C^\infty(\Omega_\ell)$, for each $\ell = 2, 3, \ldots, n$ (cf. Remark 3).*

(b) $\big\langle \hat{m}_\ell\big(x^1, x^2, \ldots, y\big), \alpha(y)\big\rangle > 0$, for each $\ell = 2, 3, \ldots, n$, where $\alpha(y)$ is a unit outward normal vector to ∂D_ℓ at $y \in \partial D_\ell$.[2]

REMARK 3. *Note that, from Assumptions 1(a), each matrix $\Big(\frac{\partial m_{\ell i}}{\partial x^1_j}\Big)_{ij}$, for $\ell = 2, 3, \ldots n$, has full rank d everywhere in Ω_ℓ, due to the hypoellipticity of the infinitesimal generator in Equation* (1.4)*. In general, the hypoellipticity is related to a strong accessibility property of controllable nonlinear systems that are driven by white noise (e.g., see [3] concerning the controllability of nonlinear systems, which is closely related to [4] and [5]; and see also [6,*

[2] We remark that

$$\mathbb{P}_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\Big\{\big(x^1(\tau^\ell), x^2(\tau^\ell), \ldots, x^\ell(\tau^\ell)\big) \in \Gamma_\ell,\ \tau^\ell < \infty\Big\} = 1,\ \forall \big(x^1_0, x^2_0, \ldots, x^\ell_0\big) \in \Omega_\ell,$$

where Γ_ℓ denotes the set of points $\big(x^1, x^2, \ldots, y\big)$, with $y \in \partial D_\ell$, such that

$$\big\langle \hat{m}_\ell\big(x^1, x^2, \ldots, y\big), \alpha(y)\big\rangle > 0, \quad \ell = 2, 3, \ldots, n.$$

Moreover, if $\tau^\ell \leq T$, with fixed $T > 0$. Then, we have $\big(x^1(\tau^\ell), x^2(\tau^\ell), \ldots, x^\ell(\tau^\ell)\big) \in \Gamma_\ell$ almost surely (see [4, Section 7]).

Section 3]). That is, the hypoellipticity assumption implies that the diffusion process $x^\ell(t)$ has a transition probability density $p^\ell_{(t)}\big((x^1,\ldots,x^\ell),\otimes_{i=1}^\ell d\mu_i\big)$, which is C^∞ on $\mathbb{R}^{2(d\times\ell)}$, and which satisfies the forward equation ${\mathcal{L}^\ell_\kappa}^* p^\ell_{(t)}=0$ as $t\to\infty$, where ${\mathcal{L}^\ell_\kappa}^*$ is adjoint of the infinitesimal generator $\mathcal{L}^\ell_\kappa$.

In what follows, we consider the following nondegenerate diffusion processes $(x^1(t), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(t), \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t))$, for each $\ell=2,3,\ldots,n$, satisfying

$$\left.\begin{aligned} dx^1(t) &= \hat{m}_1\big(x^1(t)\big)dt+\sigma\big(x^1(t)\big)dW(t)\\ dx^{\epsilon_j,j}(t) &= \hat{m}_j\big(x^1(t),x^{\epsilon_2,2}(t),\ldots,x^{\epsilon_j,j}(t)\big)dt+\sqrt{\epsilon_j}dW_j(t)dt\\ &\qquad\qquad 0<\epsilon_j\ll 1,\ \ t\geq 0,\ \ j=2,\ldots,\ell \end{aligned}\right\}, \tag{1.5}$$

where

$$\hat{m}_i\big(x^1(t),\ldots,x^{\epsilon_i,i}(t)\big)=m_i\big(x^1(t),\ldots,x^{\epsilon_i,i}(t),\kappa_i(x^{\epsilon_i,i}(t))\big),\ \ i=1,2,\ldots,\ell$$

and with an initial condition

$$\big(x^1_0,x^{\epsilon_2,2}_0,\ldots,x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}_0\big)=\big(x^1_0,x^2_0,\ldots,x^\ell_0\big).$$

Furthermore, $W_j(\cdot)$ (with $W_j(0)=0$), for $j=2,\ldots,n$, are d-dimensional standard Wiener processes and independent to $W(\cdot)$.

The infinitesimal generator, which is associated with the nondegenrate diffusion processes in Equation (1.5), is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^{\epsilon,\ell}_\kappa(\cdot)\big(x^1,x^{\epsilon_2,2},\ldots,x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}\big)&=\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{\ell}\big\langle\bigtriangledown(\cdot),\hat{m}_i\big(x^1,\ldots,x^{\epsilon_i,i}\big)\big\rangle\\ &\quad+\frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{tr}\Big\{\sigma(x^1)\sigma^T(x^1)\bigtriangledown^2(\cdot)\Big\}+\sum\nolimits_{j=2}^{\ell}\frac{\epsilon_j}{2}\,\mathrm{tr}\Big\{I_{d\times d}\bigtriangledown^2(\cdot)\Big\},\end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

for each $\ell=2,3,\ldots,n$.

In Section 2, we present our main results – where, in Subsection 2.1, we establish a connection between the minimum exit rate with which the diffusion process $x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}$ (for the nondegenerate case) exits from the domain D_ℓ and the principal eigenvalue of the infinitesimal generator $\mathcal{L}^{\epsilon,\ell}_\kappa$, with zero boundary conditions on ∂D_ℓ. In Subsection 2.2, using the formalism from Subsection 2.1, we derive a family of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equations for which we provide a verification theorem that shows the validity of the corresponding optimal control problems. Finally, in Subsection 2.2, we provide an estimate on the attainable exit probability of the diffusion process $x^\ell(t)$, from the given domain D_ℓ, with respect to a set of admissible optimal Markov controls κ^*_i, for $i=1,2,\ldots,\ell$.

Before concluding this section, it is worth mentioning that some interesting studies on estimating density functions for dynamical systems with random perturbations have been reported in literature (for example, see [7] or [8] in the context of estimating density functions for degenerate diffusions; see [9], [10] or [11, Chapters 12 and 13] in the context of nondegenerate diffusions; and see [12] or [13] in the context of an asymptotic behavior for the equilibrium density).

2. Main Results.

2.1. Minimum exit rates and principal eigenvalues. For a fixed $\ell \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$, let us consider the following eigenvalue problem

$$\left.\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}_\kappa^{\epsilon,\ell}\psi_\kappa^\ell\big(x^1, x^{\epsilon_2,2}\dots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}\big) = \lambda_\kappa^{\epsilon,\ell}\psi_\kappa^\ell\big(x^1, x^2\dots, x^\ell\big) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_\ell \\ \psi_\kappa^\ell\big(x^1, x^{\epsilon_2,2}\dots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}\big) = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega_\ell, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{2.1}$$

where the infinitesimal generator $\mathcal{L}_\kappa^{\epsilon,\ell}$ is given by Equation (1.6).

In this subsection, using Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4 from [14], we provide conditions for the existence of a unique principal eigenvalue $\lambda_\kappa^{\epsilon,\ell} > 0$ and an eigenfunction $\psi_\kappa^\ell \in W_{loc}^{2,p}\big(\Omega_\ell\big) \cap C\big(\bar{\Omega}_\ell\big)$ pairs for the eigenvalue problem in Equation (2.1), with zero boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega_\ell$. Note that the principal eigenvalue $\lambda_\kappa^{\epsilon,\ell}$ is related to the minimum exit rate with which the diffusion process $x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)$ exits from the domain D_ℓ – when the distributed control systems in Equation (1.5) are composed with a set of admissible Markov controls κ_i, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$.

The following proposition establishes a connection between the minimum exit rate and with that of the principal eigenvalue for the infinitesimal generator $\mathcal{L}_\kappa^{\epsilon,\ell}$ in Equation (1.6).

PROPOSITION 2.1. *Suppose that a set of admissible Markov controls κ_i, for $i = 1, 2, \dots n$, is given. Then, the principal eigenvalue $\lambda_\kappa^{\epsilon,\ell}$ for the infinitesimal generator $\mathcal{L}_\kappa^{\epsilon,\ell}$, with zero boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega_\ell$, is given by*

$$\lambda_\kappa^{\epsilon,\ell} = -\limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\big\{\tau^{\ell,\epsilon} > t\big\}, \tag{2.2}$$

for each $\ell = 2, 3, \dots n$, where $\tau^{\ell,\epsilon}$ is the exit-time for the diffusion process $x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)$ (which corresponds to the ℓth-subsystem in the nondegenerate case) from the domain D_ℓ, i.e.,

$$\tau^{\ell,\epsilon} = \inf\Big\{t > 0 \,\Big|\, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t) \in \partial D_\ell\Big\},$$

and the probability $\mathbb{P}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\big\{\cdot\big\}$ in Equation (2.2) is further conditioned on the initial condition $\big(x_0^1, x_0^{\epsilon_2,2}, \dots, x_0^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}\big) \in \Omega_\ell$ as well as on the admissible Markov controls κ_i, for $i = 1, 2, \dots \ell$.

Proof. Fix $\ell \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$, and for $\delta > 0$, let $D_\ell^\delta \subset D_\ell$ (with $D_\ell^\delta \cup \partial D_\ell^\delta \subset D_\ell$) be a family of bounded domains with smooth boundaries, increasing to D_ℓ as $\delta \to 0$. Let

$$\tau_\delta^{\ell,\epsilon} = \inf\Big\{t > 0 \,\Big|\, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t) \in \partial D_\ell^\delta\Big\}.$$

Then, applying Krylov's extension of the Itô's formula valid for continuous functions from $W_{loc}^{2,p}\big(\Omega_\ell\big)$, with $p \geq 2$ (e.g., see [15, Chapter II]) and the optional sampling theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\kappa^\ell\Big(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2, \dots, \hat{x}^\ell\Big) = \mathbb{E}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\Bigg\{ &\exp\big(\lambda_\kappa^{\epsilon,\ell}(t \wedge \tau_\delta^{\ell,\epsilon})\big) \\ &\times \psi_\kappa^\ell\Big(x^1(t \wedge \tau_\delta^{\ell,\epsilon}), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(t \wedge \tau_\delta^{\ell,\epsilon}), \dots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t \wedge \tau_\delta^{\ell,\epsilon})\Big)\Bigg\} \end{aligned}$$

for some $\big(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2, \ldots, \hat{x}^\ell\big) \in \Omega_\ell$. Letting $\delta \to 0$, then we have $\tau_\delta^{\ell,\epsilon} \to \tau^{\ell,\epsilon}$, almost surely, and

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_\kappa^\ell\Big(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2, \ldots, \hat{x}^\ell\Big) &= \mathbb{E}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\Bigg\{\exp\big(\lambda_\kappa^{\epsilon,\ell}(t \wedge \tau_\delta^{\ell,\epsilon})\big) \\ &\qquad \times \psi_\kappa^\ell\Big(x^1(t \wedge \tau_\delta^{\ell,\epsilon}), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(t \wedge \tau_\delta^{\ell,\epsilon}), \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t \wedge \tau_\delta^{\ell,\epsilon})\Big)\Bigg\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\Bigg\{\exp\big(\lambda_\kappa^{\epsilon,\ell} t\big)\, \psi_\kappa^\ell\Big(x^1(t), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(t), \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)\Big)\mathbf{1}\Big\{\tau_\delta^{\ell,\epsilon} > t\Big\}\Bigg\} \\ &\leq \Big\|\psi_\kappa^\ell\Big(x^1(t), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(t), \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)\Big)\Big\|_\infty \exp\big(\lambda_\kappa^{\epsilon,\ell}\, t\big)\mathbb{P}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\Big\{\tau_\delta^{\ell,\epsilon} > t\Big\}\end{aligned}$$

If we take the logarithm and divide both sides by t, then, further let $t \to \infty$, we have

$$\lambda_\kappa^{\epsilon,\ell} \geq -\liminf_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\big\{\tau^{\ell,\epsilon} > t\big\} \geq -\limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\big\{\tau^{\ell,\epsilon} > t\big\}. \tag{2.3}$$

On the other hand, let $B_k \supset D_\ell \cup \partial D_\ell$ be an open domain with smooth boundary and let $\tau_B^{\ell,\epsilon}$ be the exit-time for the diffusion process $x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)$ from the domain B_k. Further, let ψ^ℓ_{κ,B_k} and $\lambda^{\epsilon,\ell}_{\kappa,B_k}$ be the principal eigenfunction-eigenvalue pairs for the eigenvalue problem of $\mathcal{L}^{\epsilon,\ell}_\kappa$ on B_k, with $\psi^\ell_{\kappa,B_k}\Big(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2, \ldots, \hat{x}^\ell(t)\Big) = 1$, for $\big(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2, \ldots, \hat{x}^\ell\big) \in D_\ell$.

Then, we have the following

$$\begin{aligned}&\psi^\ell_{\kappa,B_k}\Big(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2, \ldots, \hat{x}^\ell\Big) \\ &\qquad = \mathbb{E}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\Bigg\{\exp\big(\lambda^{\epsilon,\ell}_{\kappa,B_k} t\big)\psi^\ell_{\kappa,B_k}\Big(x^1(t), x^{\epsilon,2}(t), \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)\Big)\mathbf{1}\Big\{\tau_B^{\ell,\epsilon} > t\Big\}\Bigg\} \\ &\qquad \geq \mathbb{E}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\Bigg\{\exp\big(\lambda^{\epsilon,\ell}_{\kappa,B_k} t\big)\, \psi^\ell_{\kappa,B_k}\Big(x^1(t), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(t), \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)\Big)\mathbf{1}\Big\{\tau_B^{\ell,\epsilon} > t\Big\}\Bigg\} \\ &\qquad \geq \inf_{\left(x^1, x^{\epsilon_2,2}, \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)\right) \in D_\ell} \Big|\psi^\ell_{\kappa,B_k}\Big(x^1(t), x^{\epsilon,2}(t), \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)\Big)\Big| \\ &\qquad\qquad \times \exp\big(\lambda^{\epsilon,\ell}_{\kappa,B_k}\, t\big)\mathbb{P}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\Big\{\tau_B^{\ell,\epsilon} > t\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, from Equation (2.3), we have the following

$$\lambda^{\epsilon,\ell}_{\kappa,B_k} \leq -\limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\big\{\tau^{\ell,\epsilon} > t\big\} \leq -\liminf_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\big\{\tau^{\ell,\epsilon} > t\big\}.$$

Then, using Proposition 4.10 of [14], we have $\lambda^{\epsilon,\ell}_{\kappa,B_k} \to \lambda^{\epsilon,\ell}_\kappa$ as $B_k \to D_\ell \cup \partial D_\ell$. This completes the proof of Proposition 2.1. □

2.2. Connection with optimal control problems. For $\ell = 2, 3, \ldots, n$, define the following HJB equations

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^{\epsilon,\ell}(\cdot)\big(x^1, \ldots, x^\ell, u_\ell\big) &= \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{\ell-1}\Big\langle \bigtriangledown(\cdot), \hat{m}_{i\setminus\ell}\big(x^1, \ldots, x^i\big)\Big\rangle + \Big\langle \bigtriangledown(\cdot), m_\ell\big(x^1, \ldots, x^\ell, u_\ell\big)\Big\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{tr}\Big\{\sigma(x^1)\sigma^T(x^1) \bigtriangledown^2(\cdot)\Big\} + \sum\nolimits_{j=2}^{\ell} \frac{\epsilon_j}{2}\operatorname{tr}\Big\{I_{d\times d} \bigtriangledown^2(\cdot)\Big\},\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

where

$$\hat{m}_{i\setminus\ell}\big(x^1(t),\dots,x^i(t)\big)=m_i\big(x^1(t),\dots,x^i(t),u_i^*(t)\big),\ i=1,2,\dots,\ell-1.$$

Note that we can associate the above HJB equations with the following family of optimal control problems

$$\max_{u_\ell\in\mathcal{U}_\ell}\Big\{\mathcal{L}^{\epsilon,\ell}\psi^\ell\big(x^1,\dots,x^\ell,u_\ell\big)+\lambda^{\epsilon,\ell}\psi^\ell\big(x^1,\dots,x^\ell\big)\Big\},\tag{2.5}$$

for $\ell=2,3,\dots,n$.

PROPOSITION 2.2. *There exist a unique $\lambda_*^{\epsilon,\ell}>0$ (which is the minimum exit rate corresponding to the ℓth-subsystem) and $\psi_*^\ell\in C^2(\Omega_\ell)\cap C(\bar\Omega_\ell)$, with $\psi_*^\ell>0$ on Ω_ℓ, that satisfy the optimal control problem in Equation* (2.5)*.*

Moreover, the admissible Markov control κ_ℓ^* is optimal if and only if κ_i^* is a measurable selector for

$$\arg\max\Big\{\mathcal{L}^{\epsilon,i}\psi_*^i\big(x^1,\dots,x^{\epsilon_i,i},\,\cdot\,\big)\Big\},\ \big(x^1,\dots,x^{\epsilon_i,i}\big)\in D_1\times\cdots\times D_i,\tag{2.6}$$

for $i=1,2,\dots,\ell-1$.

Proof. The first claim for $\psi_*^\ell\in W^{2,p}_{loc}\big(\Omega_\ell\big)\cap C\big(\bar\Omega_\ell\big)$, with $p>2$, follows from Equation (2.1) (cf. [14, Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4]). Note that if κ_i^*, for $i=1,2,\dots,\ell$, are measurable selectors of $\arg\max\Big\{\mathcal{L}^{\epsilon,i}\psi_*^i\big(x^1,\dots,x^{\epsilon_i,i},\,\cdot\,\big)\Big\}$, with $\big(x^1,\dots,x^{\epsilon_i,i}\big)\in D_1\times\cdots\times D_i$. Then, by the uniqueness claim for eigenvalue problem in Equation (2.1), we have

$$\lambda_{\kappa^*}^{\epsilon,\ell}=-\limsup_{t\to\infty}\frac{1}{t}\log\mathbb{P}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\big\{\tau^{\ell,\epsilon}>t\big\},$$

where the the probability $\mathbb{P}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\big\{\cdot\big\}$ is conditioned with respect to $\big(\kappa_1^*,\kappa_2^*,\dots,\kappa_\ell^*\big)$. Then, for any other admissible controls u_i, for $i=1,2,\dots,\ell$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}^{\epsilon,i}\psi_*^j\big(x^1,\dots,x^{\epsilon_i,i},u_i\big)+\lambda_{\kappa^*}^{\epsilon,\ell}\psi_*^i\big(x^1,\dots,x^{\epsilon_i,i}\big)\le 0,\quad\forall t\ge 0.$$

Let $Q\subset\mathbb{R}^d$ be a smooth bounded open domain containing $D_\ell\cup\partial D_\ell$. Let $\hat\psi^\ell$ and $\hat\lambda^{\epsilon,\ell}$ be the principal eigenfunction-eigenvalue pairs for the eigenvalue problem of $\mathcal{L}^{\epsilon,\ell}$ on ∂Q.

Let

$$\hat\tau^{\ell,\epsilon}=\inf\Big\{t>0\,\Big|\,x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)\notin Q\Big\},\quad\ell=2,3,\dots,n.$$

Then, under u_i, for $i=1,2,\dots,\ell$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat\psi^\ell\Big(\hat x^1,\hat x^2,\dots,\hat x^\ell\Big)\\
&\qquad\ge\mathbb{E}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\Big\{\exp\big(\hat\lambda^{\epsilon,\ell}t\big)\,\hat\psi^\ell\Big(x^1(t),x^{\epsilon_2,2}(t),\dots,x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)\Big)\mathbf{1}\Big\{\hat\tau^{\ell,\epsilon}>t\Big\}\Big\}\\
&\qquad\ge\inf_{\big(x^1,x^{\epsilon_2,2},\dots,x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)\big)\in D_\ell}\Big|\hat\psi^\ell\Big(x^1(t),x^{\epsilon,2}(t),\dots,x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)\Big)\Big|\\
&\qquad\qquad\times\exp\big(\hat\lambda^{\epsilon,\ell}t\big)\mathbb{P}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\Big\{\hat\tau^{\ell,\epsilon}>t\Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Leading to

$$\hat{\lambda}^{\epsilon,\ell} \leq -\limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}^{\epsilon}_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\big\{\tau^{\ell,\epsilon} > t\big\}.$$

Letting Q shrink to D_ℓ and using Proposition 4.10 of [14], then we have $\hat{\lambda}^{\epsilon,\ell} \to \lambda^{\epsilon,\ell}_{\kappa^*}$.Thus, we have

$$\lambda^{\epsilon,\ell}_{\kappa^*} \leq -\limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}^{\epsilon}_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\big\{\tau^{\ell,\epsilon} > t\big\}.$$

Combining with Equation (1.5), this establishes the optimality of κ^*_ℓ and the fact that $\lambda^{\epsilon,\ell}_{\kappa^*}$ is the minimum exit rate.

Conversely, let $\big(\hat{\kappa}^*_1, \hat{\kappa}^*_2, \ldots, \hat{\kappa}^*_\ell\big)$ be optimal Markov controls. Then, we have

$$\mathcal{L}^{\epsilon,i}\hat{\psi}^i\big(x^1, \ldots, x^{\epsilon_i,i}, \hat{\kappa}^*_i(x^{\epsilon_i,i})\big) + \hat{\lambda}^{\epsilon,i}_{\hat{\kappa}^*}\, \hat{\psi}^i\big(x^1, \ldots, x^{\epsilon_i,i}\big) = 0$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}^{\epsilon,i}\psi^i_*\big(x^1, \ldots, x^{\epsilon_i,i}, \hat{\kappa}^*_i(x^{\epsilon_i,i})\big) + \lambda^{\epsilon,i}_{\kappa^*}\, \psi^i_*\big(x^1, \ldots, x^{\epsilon_i,i}\big) \leq 0, \quad \forall t > 0,$$

with $\hat{\lambda}^{\epsilon,i}_{\hat{\kappa}^*} = \lambda^{\epsilon,i}_{\kappa^*}$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, \ell$.

Furthermore, notice that ψ^j_* is a scalar multiple of $\hat{\psi}^j$ and, at $\big(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2, \ldots, \hat{x}^\ell\big) \in \Omega_\ell$ (cf. [14, Theorem 1.4(a)]). Then, we see that $\hat{\kappa}^*_\ell$ is a maximizing measurable selector in Equation (2.5). This completes the proof of Proposition 2.2. □

2.3. Exit probabilities. In this subsection, for a fixed (given) $T > 0$ and $\ell \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$, we relate the attainable exit probability with which the diffusion process $x^\ell(t)$ exits from the domain D_ℓ, i.e.,

$$q^\ell\big(x^1, x^2, \ldots, x^\ell\big) = \mathbb{P}_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\big\{\tau^\ell_{\kappa^*} \leq T\big\},$$

and a family of smooth solutions for Dirichlet problems on Ω_ℓ that are associated with the nondegenerate diffusion process $x^{\epsilon,\ell}(t)$ (see Equation (2.7)) as the limiting case, when $\epsilon_\ell \to 0$, for $\ell = 2, 3, \ldots, n$.

REMARK 4. *Note that $\tau^\ell_{\kappa^*}$ is the exit-time for the diffusion process $x^\ell(t)$ from the domain D_ℓ, with respect to the admissible optimal Markov controls κ^*_i, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, \ell$.*

PROPOSITION 2.3. *Suppose that a set of admissible optimal Markov controls κ^*_i, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, satisfies Proposition 2.2. Let $\psi\big(x^1, x^2, \ldots, x^\ell\big)$, for $t \in (0, T)$, be a continuous function on ∂D_ℓ. Then, the attainable exit probability $q^\ell\big(x^1, x^2, \ldots, x^\ell\big)$ with which the diffusion process $x^\ell(t)$ exits from the domain D_ℓ is a smooth solution to the following Dirichlet problem*

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^\ell v^\ell\big(x^1, x^2, \ldots, x^\ell\big) = 0 \quad &\textit{in} \quad \Omega_\ell \\ v^\ell\big(x^1, x^2, \ldots, x^\ell\big) = \mathbb{E}_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\big\{\psi^\ell\big(x^1, x^2, \ldots, x^\ell\big)\big\} \quad &\textit{on} \quad \partial\Omega_\ell \end{aligned}\right\}. \tag{2.7}$$

Moreover, it is a continuous function on Ω_ℓ for each $\ell = 2, 3, \ldots, n$.

In order to prove the above proposition, we will consider again the nondegenerate diffusion process $(x^1(t), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(t), \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t))$, for $\ell = 2, 3, \ldots, n$ (see Equation (1.5)). Then, we relate the attainable exit probability of this diffusion process with that of the Dirichlet problems in Equation (2.7) in the limiting case, when $\epsilon_j \to 0$, for $j = 2, 3, \ldots, \ell$.

Let us define the following notations that will be useful in the sequel.

$$\theta = \tau^{\ell}_{\kappa^*} \wedge T, \qquad \theta^{\epsilon} = \tau^{\epsilon,\ell}_{\kappa^*} \wedge T,$$
$$\left\|x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell} - x^{\ell}\right\|_t = \sup_{0\le r\le t}\left|x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(r) - x^{\ell}(r)\right|, \quad \ell = 2,3,\ldots,n,$$

where $\tau^{\epsilon,\ell}_{\kappa^*}$ is the exit-time for the diffusion process $x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)$ from the domain D_ℓ (cf. $\tau^{\ell}_{\kappa^*}$ in Remark 4).

Then, we need the following lemma, which is useful for proving the above proposition.

LEMMA 2.4. *For any initial point $(x^1_0, x^2_0, \ldots, x^\ell_0) \in \Omega_\ell$, the following statements hold true*

(i) $\left\|x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell} - x^{\ell}\right\|_t \to 0$,

(ii) $\theta^{\epsilon} \to \theta$, *and*

(iii) $\big(x^{\epsilon_2,2}(\theta^{\epsilon}), \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(\theta^{\epsilon})\big) \to \big(x^2(\theta), \ldots, x^{\ell}(\theta)\big)$,

almost surely, as $\epsilon_\ell \to 0$, for $\ell = 2,3,\ldots,n$.

Proof. Part (i): Note that, for any $\ell \in \{2,3,\ldots,n\}$, the following inequality holds

$$\begin{aligned}\left|x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(r) - x^{\ell}(r)\right| &\le \int_0^t \left|\hat{f}_\ell\big(x^1(r), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(r)\ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(r)\big) - \hat{f}_\ell\big(x^1(r), x^2(r), \ldots, x^{\ell}(r)\big)\right| dr \\ &\qquad + \sqrt{\epsilon_\ell}\left|W_\ell(t)\right|, \\ &\le C\int_0^t \left|x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(r) - x^{\ell}(r)\right| dt + \sqrt{\epsilon_\ell}\left|W_\ell(t)\right|,\end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\left\|x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(r) - x^{\ell}(r)\right\|_t \le C\int_0^t \left|x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(r) - x^{\ell}(r)\right| dt + \sqrt{\epsilon_\ell}|W_\ell(t)|,$$

where C is a Lipschitz constant. Using the Gronwall-Bellman inequality, we obtain the following

$$\left\|x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(r) - x^{\ell}(r)\right\|_t \le c\sqrt{\epsilon_\ell}\left\|W_\ell\right\|_t,$$

where c is a constant that depends on C and t. Hence, we have

$$\left\|x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(r) - x^{\ell}(r)\right\|_t \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \epsilon_\ell \to 0,$$

for each $\ell = 2,3,\ldots,n$.

Part (ii): Next, let us show θ satisfies the following bounds

$$\theta^* \le \theta \le \theta_*,$$

almost surely, where

$$\theta^* = \min_{\ell\in\{2,3,\ldots,n\}}\Big\{\limsup_{\epsilon_\ell\to 0}\theta^{\epsilon}\Big\}$$

and

$$\theta_* = \max_{\ell \in \{2,3,\ldots,n\}} \Big\{ \liminf_{\epsilon_\ell \to 0} \theta^\epsilon \Big\}.$$

Notice that D_ℓ is open, then it follows from Part (i) that if $\theta = \tau^\ell \wedge T = T$, then $\theta^\epsilon = T$, almost surely, for all ϵ_ℓ sufficiently small. Then, we will get Part (ii). Similarly, if $\theta^\epsilon = T$ and $x^{\epsilon,\ell}(\theta^\epsilon) \in D_\ell$, then the statement in Part (i) implies Part (ii). Then, we can assume that $x^\ell(\theta) \in \partial D_\ell$ and $x^{\epsilon,\ell}(\theta^\epsilon) \in \partial D_\ell$. Moreover, if $x^{\epsilon,\ell}(\theta^\epsilon) \in \partial D_\ell$, then, from Part (i), $x^\ell(\theta_*) \in \partial D_\ell$, almost surely, and, consequently, $\theta_* \geq \theta$, almost surely.

For the case $\theta^* \leq \theta$, let us define an event $\Psi_{a,\alpha}$ (with $a > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$) as follow: there exists $t \in [\theta, \theta + a]$ such that the distance $\varrho\big(x^\ell(t), \partial D_\ell\big) \geq \alpha$. Notice that if this holds together with $\big\|x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell} - x^\ell\big\|_t < \alpha$, then we have $\theta^\epsilon < \theta + a$. Hence, from Part (i), we have $\theta^* < \theta + a$ on $\Psi_{a,\alpha}$, almost surely.

On the other hand, from Assumption 1(b), we have the following

$$\mathbb{P}_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\Big\{ \bigcup\nolimits_{\alpha > 0} \Psi_{a,\alpha} \Big\} = 1.$$

Then, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\Big\{ \theta^* < \theta + a \Big\} = 1,$$

since a is an arbitrary, we obtain $\theta^* < \theta$, almost surely.

Finally, notice that the statement in Part (iii) is a consequence of Part (i) and Part (ii). This completes the proof of Lemma 2.4. □

Proof. [Proof of Proposition 2.3] Note that, from Assumption 1(b), it is sufficient to show that $q^\ell(x^1, \ldots, x^\ell)$ is a smooth solution (almost everywhere in Ω_ℓ with respect to Lebesgue measure) to the Dirichlet problems in Equation (2.7).

For a fixed $\ell \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$, consider the following infinitesimal generator which corresponds to the nondegenerate diffusion processes $(x^1(t), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(t), \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t))$

$$\mathcal{L}^{\epsilon,\ell} \upsilon^\ell + \sum\nolimits_{j=2}^{\ell} \frac{\epsilon_j}{2} \triangle_{x^{\epsilon_j,j}} \upsilon^\ell = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_\ell, \tag{2.8}$$

where $\triangle_{x^{\epsilon_j,j}}$ is the Laplace operator in the variable $x^{\epsilon_j,j}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\epsilon,\ell}$ is the infinitesimal generator in Equation (1.5).

Note that the infinitesimal generator $\mathcal{L}^{\epsilon,\ell}$ is a uniformly parabolic equation and, from Assumption 1(b), its solution satisfies the following boundary condition

$$\upsilon^\ell\big(x^1, x^{\epsilon_2,2}, \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}\big) = \psi\big(x^1, x^{\epsilon_2,2}, \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}\big) \quad \text{on} \quad \partial D, \tag{2.9}$$

where

$$\upsilon^\ell\big(x^1, x^{\epsilon_2,2}, \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}\big) = \mathbb{E}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\Big\{ \psi\big(x^1(\theta^\epsilon), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(\theta^\epsilon), \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(\theta^\epsilon)\big) \Big\}, \tag{2.10}$$

with $\theta^\epsilon = \tau^{\epsilon,\ell} \wedge T$.

In particular, let ψ_k, with $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, be a sequence of bounded functions that are continuous on ∂D and satisfying the following conditions

$$\psi_k\big(x^1, x^{\epsilon_2,2}, \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}\big) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \big(x^1(t), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(t), \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)\big) \in \Gamma_\ell \\ 0 & \text{if } \big(x^1(t), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(t), \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)\big) \in \Omega_\ell \\ & \qquad \text{and} \quad \varrho\big(x^{\epsilon,\ell}, \partial D_\ell\big) > \frac{1}{k} \end{cases}$$

and

$$0 \leq \psi_k\big(x^1, x^{\epsilon_2,2}, \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}\big) \leq 1 \text{ if } \big(x^1(t), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(t), \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(t)\big) \in \Omega_\ell \\ \text{and} \quad \varrho\big(x^{\epsilon,\ell}, \partial D_\ell\big) \leq \tfrac{1}{k}.$$

Moreover, the bounded functions further satisfy the following

$$\big|\psi_k - \psi_l\big| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k, l \to \infty \tag{2.11}$$

uniformly on any compact subset of $\bar{\Omega}_\ell$. Then, with $\psi = \psi_k$,

$$\upsilon_k^\ell\big(x^1, x^{\epsilon_2,2}, \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}\big) = \mathbb{E}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\Big\{\psi_k\big(x^1(\theta^\epsilon), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(\theta^\epsilon), \ldots, x^{\epsilon,\ell}(\theta^\epsilon)\big)\Big\}$$

satisfies Equations (2.9) and (2.10). Then, from the continuity of ψ_k (cf. Lemma 2.4, Parts (i)-(iii)) and the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem (see [16, Chapter 4]), we have the following

$$\upsilon_k^\ell\big(x^1, x^{\epsilon_2,2}, \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}\big) \to \underbrace{\mathbb{E}^\epsilon_{x_{\widehat{1,\ell}}}\Big\{\psi_k\big(x^1(\theta^\epsilon), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(\theta^\epsilon), \ldots, x^{\epsilon,\ell}(\theta^\epsilon)\big)\Big\}}_{\triangleq q_k^\ell\left(x^1, \ldots, x^\ell\right)}, \tag{2.12}$$

where $\theta \to \theta^\epsilon$ as $\epsilon_j \to 0$ for all $j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, \ell\}$. Furthermore, in the above equation, $\big(x^1(t), x^2(t), \ldots, x^\ell(t)\big)$ is a solution to Equation (2.7), when $\epsilon_j = 0$, for $j = 2, 3, \ldots, \ell$, with an initial condition $\big(x^{\epsilon,1}(0), x^{\epsilon_2,2}(0), \ldots, x^{\epsilon_\ell,\ell}(0)\big) = \big(x_0^1, x_0^2, \ldots, x_0^\ell\big)$.

Note that $q_k^\ell\big(x^1, \ldots, x^\ell\big)$ satisfies Equation (2.8), with $\upsilon^\ell = \upsilon_k^\ell$, and, in addition, it is a distribution solution to the Dirichlet problem in Equation (2.7), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_\ell} \mathcal{L}^{\ell^*}\phi q_k^\ell d\Omega_\ell, &= \lim_{\epsilon_j \to 0,\, \forall j \in \{2,3,\ldots,\ell\}} \int_{\Omega_\ell} \Big(\mathcal{L}^{\ell^*}\phi + \sum\nolimits_{j=2}^{\ell} \frac{\epsilon_j}{2} \triangle_{x^{\epsilon_j,j}} \phi\Big) \upsilon_k^\ell d\Omega_\ell, \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

for any test function $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_\ell)$.

Finally, notice that

$$q^\ell\big(x^1, \ldots, x^\ell\big) = \lim_{k \to \infty} q_k^\ell\big(x^1, \ldots, x^\ell\big),$$

almost everywhere in Ω_ℓ. From Assumption 1(a) (i.e., the hypoellipticity), $q^\ell\big(x^1, x^2, \ldots, x^\ell\big)$ is a smooth solution to Equation (2.7) (almost everywhere) in Ω_ℓ and continuous on the boundary of Ω_ℓ. This completes the proof of Proposition 2.3. □

REMARK 5. *Here, we remark that the statements in Proposition 2.3 will make sense only if we have the following conditions*

$$\tau^1_{\kappa^*} \geq \tau^2_{\kappa^*} \geq \cdots \geq \tau^\ell_{\kappa^*},$$

where $\tau^1_{\kappa^*} = \inf\big\{t > 0 \,\big|\, x^1(t) \in \partial D_1\big\}$. *Moreover, such conditions depend on the constituting subsystems in Equation* (1.1)*, the admissible controls from the measurable sets* $\prod_{i=1}^\ell \mathcal{U}_i$*, as well as on the given domains* D_i*, for* $i = 1, 2, \ldots, \ell$.

REFERENCES

[1] G. K. BEFEKADU AND P. J. ANTSAKLIS, *Exit probabilities for a chain of distributed control systems with small random perturbations*, arXiv:1408.6260 [math.CT]

[2] L. HÖRMANDER, *Hypoelliptic second order differential operators,* Acta Math. 119 (1967), pp. 147–171.

[3] H. J. SUSSMANN AND V. JURDJEVIC, *Controllability of nonlinear systems*, J. Diff. Equ. 12 (1972), pp. 95–116.

[4] D. STROOCK, AND S. R. S. VARADHAN, *On degenerate elliptic-parabolic operators of second order and their associated diffusions*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 25 (1972), pp. 651–713.

[5] K. ICHIHARA AND H. KUNITA, *A classification of the second order degenerate elliptic operators and its probabilistic characterization*, Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheor. Verw. Geb., 30 (1974), pp. 253–254.

[6] D. L. ELLIOTT, *Diffusions on manifolds arising from controllable systems*, in Geometric Methods in System Theory, D. Q. Mayne and R.W. Brockett, eds. Reidel Publ. Co., Dordrecht, Holland, 1973, pp. 285–294.

[7] O. HERNÁNDEZ-LERMA, *Exit probabilities for a class of perturbed degenerate systems*, SIAM J Contr Optim 19 (1981), pp. 39–51.

[8] F. DELARUE, AND S. MENOZZI, *Density estimates for a random noise propagating through a chain of differential equations*, J. Funct. Anal., 259 (2010), pp. 1577–1630.

[9] S. J. SHEU, *Some estimates of the transition density of a nondegenerate diffusion Markov process*, Ann. Probab., 19 (1991), pp. 538–561.

[10] M. V. DAY, *Recent progress on the small parameter exit problem*, Stochastics, 20 (1987), pp. 121–150.

[11] A. FRIEDMAN, *Stochastic differential equations and applications*, Academic Press, vol. II, 1976.

[12] Y. KIFER, *The inverse problem for small random perturbations of dynamical systems*, Israel J. Math., 40 (1981), pp. 165–174.

[13] A. BISWASA, AND A. BUDHIRAJAB, *Exit time and invariant measure asymptotics for small noise constrained diffusions*, Stoch. Proc. Appl., 121 (2011), pp. 899–924.

[14] A. QUAAS AND B. SIRAKOV, *Principal eigenvalue and the Dirichlet problem for fully nonlinear elliptic operators*, Advances in Math., 218 (2008), pp. 105–135.

[15] V. S. BORKAR, *Optimal control of diffusion processes*, In: Longman Scientific and Technical, Harlow, UK, 1989

[16] H. L. ROYDEN, *Real analysis*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1988.